

### REMARKS

In the non-final Office Action mailed November 3, 1999, the Examiner noted that claims 26-45 are pending in this case. Claims 26-45 stand rejected. By the Amendment Applicant is amending claims 26, 33, 35, 36, 39-43, and 45. Applicants submit that the amended claims more clearly point out the patentable features of the invention and distinguish the same over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### Drawings

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that FIGS. 1 and 4A should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art" because only that which is old is illustrated. Applicant agrees to include such legend on formal drawings submitted after receipt of a notice of allowance.

### Claim Objections

In paragraphs 3-12 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 26, 33, 35, 36, 39-43, and 45 and suggested alternative wording. Applicant has substantially incorporated the Examiner's suggested claim language and, therefore, submits that these objections are overcome. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 26-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,570,108 to McLaughlin et al. (*McLaughlin*), U.S. Patent No. 4,733,229 to Whitehead (*Whitehead*), and U.S. Patent No. 5,204,748 to Lagoni (*Lagoni*). As discussed below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as applied to the claims as amended.

In paragraph 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26, 27, 34-37, and 41-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McLaughlin* in view of *Whitehead*. *McLaughlin* describes a method and apparatus for display calibration and control and includes control circuitry 16D.

The Office Action states that the *McLaughlin* control circuitry 16D corresponds with the display control device recited in independent claim 26. Upon closer examination of the *McLaughlin* reference, Applicant submits that such a correspondence is unjustified.

The *McLaughlin* circuitry 16D adjusts the electron guns (and electron beam aiming electromagnets) within display screen 16A to control the characteristics (including geometric and color parameters) of the image displayed on screen 16A, in response to signals from manual controls 16B or from processor 16C (which relays control signals communicated to it from processor 11 via bidirectional communication link 16E). Importantly, the *McLaughlin* circuitry 16D is not configured to generate a high-luminance viewing window according to a received video signal and a received window information signal. Indeed, *McLaughlin* does not teach or suggest the desirability of a high-luminance video viewing window, much less describe a system and method for providing such a window.

The *Whitehead* reference fails to remedy the deficiencies of McLaughlin. In particular, *Whitehead* is directed to:

... a CRT display of digitized gray scale information from a diagnostic scan, [where] an operator-selectable area of the display can be highlighted to increase the contrast and brightness of a selected portion of the image while simultaneously viewing a wide range of information levels in the background portion of the image. (See, Abstract, emphasis added)

Thus, rather than providing windowed information in response to an application program, *Whitehead* teaches an operator selecting a portion of the displayed information and increasing the contrast and brightness of that selected portion. Hence the displayed information inside *Whitehead's* enhanced region is simply a brightness and contrast enhanced version of the original information. *Whitehead* also lacks any suggestion relating to the desirability or provision of a high-luminance *video window*.

Further, as stated in the earlier-filed preliminary amendment, *Whitehead* also lacks any suggestion of the "host computer system for running an application program" or the "processor device for automatically generating a window control signal in response to said application program" as recited in claims 26.

Independent claims 36, 43, and 45 contain elements and limitations similar to those of independent claim 26 and therefore patentably distinguish over the art of record for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 26.

Dependent claims 27-35, 37-42, and 44, as amended, depend directly or indirectly from claims 26, 36, and 43 and, as such, include all of the limitations of claims 26, 36, 43. These dependent claims also include additional limitations not shown in the prior art of record. Thus, for these reasons, and those discussed above in connection with the § 103(a) rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims patentably

distinguish over the art of record. Withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and that action is courteously solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney should there be any questions regarding this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard D. Cappels Sr.

Date: March 3, 2000

By: Robert D. Wasson

Robert D. Wasson, Reg. No. 40, 218  
Carr & Ferrell LLP  
2225 East Bayshore Road, Suite 200  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
Phone (650) 812-3400  
Fax (650) 812-3444